Submitted to *Operations Research*
manuscript (Please, provide the manuscript number!)

Authors are encouraged to submit new papers to INFORMS journals by means of a style file template, which includes the journal title. However, use of a template does not certify that the paper has been accepted for publication in the named journal. INFORMS journal templates are for the exclusive purpose of submitting to an INFORMS journal and should not be used to distribute the papers in print or online or to submit the papers to another publication.

arXiv:1702.06254v1 [math.OC] 21 Feb 2017

Global linear convergent algorithm to compute the minimum volume enclosing ellipsoid

Jie Tao
School of Business, University of Shanghai for Science and Technology, Yangpu, Shanghai 200093, taojie@usst.edu.cn
Wei Zhang
College of Science, Shanghai University, Baoshan, Shanghai 200444, garfunkel@shu.edu.cn
Chao Lu
School of Management, Shanghai University, Baoshan, Shanghai 200444, 06luchao@163.com

The minimum volume enclosing ellipsoid (MVEE) problem is an optimization problem in the basis of many practical problems. This paper describes some new properties of this model and proposes a first-order oracle algorithm, the Adjusted Coordinate Descent (ACD) algorithm, to address the MVEE problem. The ACD algorithm is globally linear convergent and has an overwhelming advantage over the other algorithms in cases where the dimension of the data is large. Moreover, as a byproduct of the convergence property of the ACD algorithm, we prove the global linear convergence of the Frank-Wolfe type algorithm (illustrated by the case of Wolfe-Atwood's algorithm), which supports the conjecture of Todd. Furthermore, we provide a new interpretation for the means of choosing the coordinate axis of the Frank-Wolfe type algorithm from the perspective of the smoothness of the coordinate axis, i.e., the algorithm chooses the coordinate axis with the worst smoothness at each iteration. This finding connects the first-order oracle algorithm and the linear optimization oracle algorithm on the MVEE problem. The numerical tests support our theoretical results.

Key words: Minimum Volume Enclosing Ellipsoid; First-order oracle Algorithm; Coordinate Descent

History:

1. Introduction

The minimum volume enclosing ellipsoid (MVEE) (also known as the Löwner ellipsoid) of an arbitrary given point set $X = \{x_1, \ldots, x_m\}$ is studied in this paper, where $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$. In addition to several

traditional applications discussed in Kumar and Yildirim. (2005), recently the MVEE has arisen in a number of applications, including nonlinear support vector machines (Kumar and Yilidrim. (2011)), the geometry of differential privacy (Nikolov et al. (2016)), flow feature extraction (Li et al. (2015)), sensor selection (Joshi and Boyd. (2009)), and statistics (Ahipasaoglu. (2015)).

F. John first considered the MVEE enclosing a compact set $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$. He showed any ellipsoid in $\mathbb{R}^n$ is determined by at most $\frac{n(n+1)}{2}$ points, which lies at the basis of the core set theory. John also showed the existence of the n-rounding ellipsoid for an arbitrary point set X (see John. (2014)).

Generally, the methods to address the MVEE problem can be categorized into two parts, the Newton-type method and the Frank-Wolfe type method. With respect to the Newton-type method, Nesterov and Nemirovski. (1994) developed an interior-point algorithm that computes a $(1+\epsilon)-$ approximation to the MVEE in $O(n^{3.5}\ln(\frac{Rn}{\epsilon r}))$ arithmetic operations, where $B_r \subseteq$ conv.hull$(X) \subseteq B_R$ for some Euclidean balls B_r and B_R with radius $0 \leq r \leq R$, ϵ is the error bound. Vandenberghe et al. (1998)) used the interior point method to solve the max det problem, which can also be used to solve the MVEE problem. Sun and Freund. (2004) proposed the "dual reduced-Newton (DRN)" algorithm to solve the MVEE problem. This algorithm performs very well for problems with moderately sized samples, while active-set strategies could help in large-scale cases. However, memory problems occur, and the efficiency of the algorithm is reduced when the dimension of the data set grows.

With respect to the Frank-Wolfe method (sometimes called the conditional gradient method), Khachiyan. (1996) proposed the notion of ϵ-primal feasibility and computed a $(1+\epsilon)n$ rounding ellipsoid of an arbitrary point set X in $O(mn^2(\frac{1}{\epsilon}+\ln n+\ln\ln m))$ arithmetic operations. Based on the pioneering work of Khachiyan, some progress has been made recently. Kumar and Yildirim. (2005) presented an efficient initialization scheme, which could reduce the complexity bound by $O(mn^2(\ln\ln m))$. In addition, their algorithm established the existence of an ϵ-core set which could be of great significance in computational geometry. Later, Yildirim. (2006) applied this algorithm to compute the minimum volume covering ellipsoid of ellipsoids. Todd and Yildirim. (2007)

modified the work of Kumar and Yildirim with a dropping technique, which is equivalent to the "away step" in the Frank-Wolfe method. Coincidentally, this technique was similar to the one adopted by Atwood. (1973) in the D-Optimal problem. Therefore this algorithm is also called the Wolfe-Atwood (WA) algorithm. Ahipasaoglu et al. (2008) introduced the ϵ-approximate optimality notion and proved the local linear convergence of the WA algorithm for the MVEE problem, and they showed that the convergence rate is perturbed by a data-dependent constant. Based on this, Kumar and Yilidrim. (2011) proposed to apply the Frank-Wolfe method with away steps to the support vector classification problem and showed the linear convergence of the algorithm.

The idea of adopting the gradient-type coordinate descent method into the MVEE problem is from two aspects: One is that the coordinate descent method changes only one element of the iteration point u in each iteration, thus the arithmetic operations in each iteration, such as the computation of the inverse and the determinant of a matrix could be simplified via the rank-one modification formula. The other is that the coordinate smoothness parameter of the objective function can be estimated (see Lemma 1), and thus the step size of the gradient-type algorithm could be easily obtained. Therefore, in this paper, we integrate the idea of the WA algorithm with the coordinate descent algorithm and propose the adjusted coordinate descent (ACD) algorithm to address the MVEE problem.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows: in the second section, we elaborate on the theory and algorithm of the MVEE problem, including the formulation of the model, the existence of the optimal solution, duality and the algorithm to solve the model. In the third section, we propose the ACD algorithm, and prove several new properties of the objective function of the MVEE problem. Also, we adopt these properties to prove the global linear convergence of the ACD algorithm. Moreover, as a byproduct of the convergence result for the ACD algorithm, we prove the global linear convergence of the WA algorithm, which testifies the conjecture of Todd. (2016). In the fourth section, several numerical examples are included, demonstrating that the ACD algorithm has an overwhelming advantage over the other algorithms as the dimension grows. In the fifth section, we provide the conclusions and the directions for future research.

1.1. Notations

Unless otherwise specified, all norms $\|\cdot\|$ used in this paper are the Euclidean norms. $\|x\|_H = \sqrt{x^T H x}$ represents the H-shaped ellipsoidal norm with H being positive definite. $\nabla f(x)$ represents the gradient of function f with respect to the vector x, while $\nabla^2 f(x)$ represents the Hessian matrix of function f with respect to the vector x. $e \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is an n dimensional vector in Euclidean space with all the elements being 1. $\mathbb{S}^n$, $\mathbb{S}^n_+$, and $\mathbb{S}^n_{++}$ denote the sets of, respectively, the symmetric $n \times n$ matrix, the symmetric positive semidefinite $n \times n$ matrix, and the symmetric positive definite $n \times n$ matrix. X represents the point set of m points, as well as the matrix formed by these m points, i.e., $X = [x_1, \ldots, x_m], x_i \in \mathbb{R}^n, i = 1, \ldots, m$. $aff(X)$ represents the affine hull of the set X. I_n represents the unit matrix of order n. Let $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$, U represents a diagonal matrix of order n formed by the elements of u. $\triangle$ represents a probability simplex, that is, $\triangle = \{x | e^T x = 1, x \geq 0\}$. $\mathrm{Vol}(B_n)$ represents the volume of an n-dimensional unit ball whose center is at the origin, that is: $\mathrm{Vol}(B_n) = \frac{(\pi)^{\frac{n}{2}}}{\Gamma(\frac{n}{2}+1)}$.

2. Theory and Algorithm of MVEE

2.1. Volume of n-ellipsoid

An ellipsoid $E(H, c)$ can be expressed as $E(H, c) = \{x | (x-c)^T H (x-c) \leq n\}$, where $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $H \in \mathbb{S}^n_{++}$. Applying the Cholesky factorization to $H \in \mathbb{S}^n_{++}$, we obtain a lower triangular matrix L such that $H = LL^T$. Hence the ellipsoid $E(H, c)$ can also be expressed as $\{x | \|L^T(x-c)\| \leq \sqrt{n}\}$ or $\{x | x = c + (\sqrt{n} L^{-T}) z, \|z\| \leq 1\}$, that is, the ellipsoid $E(H, c)$ is the result of the affine transformation $x' = (\sqrt{n} L^{-T}) x + c$ of a unit ball centered at the origin. Since the translation does not affect the volume, and the linear transformation $y = \sqrt{n} L^{-T} x$ changes the volume of the unit ball to $\det(\sqrt{n} L^{-T}) \mathrm{Vol}(B_n)$, it follows that the volume of the ellipsoid in n-dimensional space is $\frac{n^{\frac{n}{2}} \mathrm{Vol}(B_n)}{\sqrt{\det(H)}}$, that is, the larger $\det(H)$ is, the smaller the volume of $E(H, c)$ is.

2.2. Model of MVEE

The MVEE $E(H,0)$ of a centrally symmetric set X can be modeled as an optimization problem (see Sun and Freund. (2004) for other equivalent forms of MVEE model)

$$\max_{H\in\mathbb{S}^n_{++},c\in\mathbb{R}^n} \det H, s.t. X\subseteq E(H,0),$$

or

$$\min_{H\in\mathbb{S}^n_{++},c\in\mathbb{R}^n} -\det H,\ s.t.\ (x_i)^T H(x_i)\le n, i=1,\dots,m.$$

Since $-\det H$ is not a convex function, the above optimization problem is difficult to solve. A common method to overcome this difficulty is to convert the objective function into $-\ln\det H$, since $-\ln\det H$ is a convex function (see Boyd and Vandenberghe. (2004) for the theorem "$f:\mathbb{R}^n\to\mathbb{R}, f$ is a convex function if and only if $\forall x,y\in\mathbb{R}^n, g(t)=f(x+ty)$ is a convex function."). Thus, the model of $E(H,0)$ can be converted into a convex optimization problem (P):

$$\min_{H\in\mathbb{S}^n,c\in\mathbb{R}^n} f(H)=-\ln\det H,\ s.t.\ (x_i)^T H(x_i)\le n, i=1,\dots,m. \tag{1}$$

2.3. Existence and Uniqueness of Solutions

As the objective function of model (P) is continuous, Todd. (2016) noted that if the set of all the feasible points is compact, the existence of the solution can be proven by the Weierstrass's Theorem. Unfortunately, $H\in\mathbb{S}^n_{++}$ is an open set and this theorem cannot be used directly. Todd. (2016) proposed to substitute the constraint $H\in\mathbb{S}^n_{++}$ with $-\ln\det H\le -\ln\det(\epsilon I_n)$ for a small enough $\epsilon>0$, so that the set of feasible points is compact and the solution of model (P) exists. In addition, The uniqueness of the solution is owing to the strict convexity of $-\ln\det H$ on the feasible set.

2.4. Duality and Optimality Conditions

The Lagrange function of model (P) is: $L(H,u)=-\ln\det H+\sum_{i=1}^m u_i(x_i^T H x_i-n)$, and the dual function is:

$$q(u)=\min_{H\in\mathbb{S}^n_{++}} L(H,u)=\begin{cases}\ln\det(XUX^T)+n(1-e^Tu), & \text{if } H^{-1}=XUX^T,\\ -\infty, & \text{otherwise,}\end{cases}$$

where U is a diagonal matrix with $U_{ii}=u_i$. So it follows that the Lagrange dual problem $(D^{'})$ is: $\min_{u\geq 0}-\ln\det(XUX^T)+n(e^Tu-1)$. Since $\forall u^{'}\in\mathbb{R}^n$, there exists a $u\in\mathbb{R}^n$ and a $\lambda\geq 0$ such that $u^{'}=\lambda u$. Substituting these into model $(D^{'})$, we obtain that the optimal value of model $(D^{'})$ is attained at $\lambda=1$. Therefore, the dual problem can also be written as (D):

$$\begin{aligned} &\min_u\ g(u)=-\ln\det(XUX^T),\\ &s.t.\ \ u\in\triangle \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

The optimality conditions, the weak and strong duality can be referred to Ahipasaoglu et al. (2008), Todd. (2016), which will not be discussed in detail here.

2.5. MVEE of an arbitrary point set

Khachiyan. (1996) noted that the MVEE of an arbitrary point set X can be obtained by computing the MVEE of a centrally symmetric point set as follows:

(1) Lift up the point $x_i\in X\subseteq\mathbb{R}^n$ into $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}:\quad &\mathbb{R}^n\rightarrow\mathbb{R}^{n+1}\\ &x_i\rightarrow y_i=(x_i,1), \end{aligned}$$

and let $Y=\{\pm y_i\}_{i=1}^m$, i.e., Y is a centrally symmetric point set containing $2m$ points.

(2) We can use model (P) or model (D) to compute the MVEE of Y. Denoting the optimal solution pair as (H^*,u^*), we have:

$$\begin{aligned} H^* &=(YU^*Y^T)^{-1}\\ &=(\begin{pmatrix} X\\ e^T\end{pmatrix}U^*\begin{pmatrix} X\\ e^T\end{pmatrix}^T)^{-1}\\ &=(\begin{pmatrix} XU^*X^T & Xu^*\\ (Xu^*)^T & 1\end{pmatrix})^{-1}\\ &=(\begin{pmatrix} I_n & Xu^*\\ 0 & 1\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} XU^*X^T-(Xu^*)(Xu^*)^T & 0\\ 0 & 1\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} I_n & 0\\ (Xu^*)^T & 1\end{pmatrix})^{-1}\\ &=\begin{pmatrix} I_n & 0\\ -(Xu^*)^T & 1\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} (XU^*X^T-(Xu^*)(Xu^*)^T)^{-1} & 0\\ 0 & 1\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} I_n & -Xu^*\\ 0 & 1\end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $H_X = (XU^*X^T - (Xu^*)(Xu^*)^T)^{-1}$, $c = Xu^*$, we have

$$(x_i^T, 1)\begin{pmatrix} I_n & 0 \\ -c^T & 1 \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} H_X & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} I_n & c \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} x_i \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \leq n+1,$$

or equivalently

$$(x_i - c)^T H_X (x_i - c) \leq n.$$

From the above analysis, it can be seen that the MVEE of an arbitrary point set X can be obtained by computing the MVEE of a centrally symmetric point set. Therefore, we can focus on addressing model (P) and (D).

2.6. Algorithm

The classical method to address model (P) is the Newton type algorithm (see Sun and Freund. (2004)), while the classical method to address model (D) is the Frank-Wolfe (FW) type algorithm (see Khachiyan. (1996), Kumar and Yildirim. (2005), Ahipasaoglu et al. (2008)). Numerical experiments show that the FW type algorithm is more efficient for the case of large-scale or huge-scale data sets (especially for high-dimensional data sets) than the Newton type algorithm (Todd. (2016)). Atwood. (1973) was the first to apply the FW type algorithm to compute the MVEE (in fact, Atwood was trying to address the D-optimal design problem in statistics, which is the same as the duality problem in MVEE. Therefore, Atwood can be considered the first to apply the FW algorithm to the MVEE problem). Khachiyan. (1996) was the first to obtain the computational complexity of the FW type algorithm on the MVEE problem. Kumar and Yildirim. (2005) extended the work of Khachiyan. (1996), and proposed a new initialization scheme to improve the efficiency of the algorithm. Based on the work of Kumar and Yilidrim, Ahipasaoglu et al. (2008) proposed the "dropping points" technique and discovered the local linear convergence rate of the FW algorithm on the MVEE problem. Table 1 compares the computational complexity of different classical methods for solving the MVEE problem.

Table 1 Computation complexity of classical algorithms to compute the MVEE.

	Interior Point Algorithm	FW-K Algorithm	FW-KY Algorithm
Complexity	$O(m^{3.5}\ln(\frac{m}{\epsilon}))$	$O(mn^2([(1+\epsilon)^{\frac{2}{d+1}}-1]^{-1}+\ln n+\ln\ln m))$	$O(mn^2([(1+\epsilon)^{\frac{2}{d+1}}-1]^{-1}+\ln n))$

FW-K stands for the Frank - Wolfe algorithm using the Khachiyan initialization scheme; FW-KY stands for the Frank - Wolfe algorithm using the Kumar and Yildirim's initialization shceme

In the following, the FW-K and WA algorithms are introduced as examples. Suppose the optimal solution pair is (H^*, u^*), then the optimality condition yields:

$$u_i^* \geq 0, i = 1, \ldots, m,$$

$$e^T u^* = 1,$$

$$x_i^T H^* x_i \leq n, i = 1, \ldots, m,$$

$$u_i^*(x_i^T H^* x_i - n) = 0, i = 1, \ldots, m,$$

$$(XU^*X^T)^{-1} = H^*.$$

Therefore, u is the optimal point of model (D) if and only if $H(u) = (XUX^T)^{-1}$ is feasible for model (P). Based on this, Khachiyan. (1996) proposed the notion of the ϵ-primal feasible solution.

Definition 1. Suppose u is a feasible solution of (D), u is said to be ϵ-primal feasible if $H(u) = (XUX^T)^{-1}$ satisfies $x_i^T H(u) x_i \leq (1+\epsilon)n, i = 1, \ldots, m$.

In the FW-K algorithm, the objective function is linearized to generate subproblems, and the optimal solutions of the subproblems are used to generate the descent direction. Using this direction and the corresponding optimal step size, model (D) can be solved iteratively. If the current iteration point is u_k, the linearized subproblem of model (D) is:

$$\max_u \ \kappa(u_k)^T u$$

$$st. \quad u \in \triangle$$

where $\kappa(u_k) = \nabla g(u_k)$, and $\kappa(u_k)_i$ represents the i-th component of $\kappa(u_k)$. Suppose $j = \arg\max_{i=1,\ldots,m} \kappa(u_k)_i$, and then e_j is the optimal solution of the above subproblem. So if the optimal step size is λ_k, the new iteration point is $u_{k+1} = u_k + \lambda_k(e_j - u_k)$, or equivalently, u_{k+1} can be seen as a convex combination of u_k and e_j. As λ_k is chosen to minimize the objective function $g(u)$, it follows that:

$$\kappa(u_k + \lambda(e_j - u_k)) = 0 \Rightarrow \lambda_k = \frac{\kappa_j - n}{n(\kappa_j - 1)}.$$

We describe the FW-K algorithm as follows:

FW-K algorithm for model (D)

Input. $X=\{x_1,\ldots,x_m\}$, $\epsilon>0$;

Step 0. Initialization $u_0=(\frac{1}{m},\ldots,\frac{1}{m})$;

Step 1. While not converged, $j\leftarrow \arg\max_{i=1,\ldots,m}\kappa(u_k)^i$,$\lambda_k=\frac{\kappa_j-n}{n(\kappa_j-1)}$, $u_{k+1}\leftarrow u_k+\lambda_k(e_j-u_k)$;

Step 2. Output $u^*=u_k$;

In the FW-K algorithm, the initial point u_0 is initialized as $u_0=(\frac{1}{m},\ldots,\frac{1}{m})$. Kumar and Yildirim. (2005) proposed a core set based initialization scheme, which is more effective than Khachiyan's initialization scheme. Furthermore, since the FW-K algorithm, as well as the FW-KY algorithm, yields only an ϵ-primal feasible solution, which fails to satisfy the complementary slackness condition, Ahipasaoglu et al. (2008) proposed the notion of ϵ-primal feasible solution to address this deficiency (see also Todd and Yildirim. (2007), Todd. (2016)):

Definition 2. If u is an ϵ-primal feasible solution satisfying $x_i^TH(u)x_i\geq(1-\epsilon)n, i=1,\ldots,m$ when $u_i>0$, then u is an ϵ-approximately optimal solution.

To improve the FW-K algorithm, Todd and Yildirim. (2007) and Ahipasaoglu et al. (2008) introduced the "away-step" strategy of the Frank-Wolfe algorithm, resulting in the Wolfe-Atwood (WA) algorithm.

WA algorithm for model (D)

Input. $X=\{x_1,\ldots,x_m\}$, $\epsilon>0$;

Step 0. Using the Kumar - Yildirim initialize scheme to initialize u_0;

Step 1. While not converged, $j_+\leftarrow\arg\max_{i=1,\ldots,m}\kappa(u_k)_i$, $\kappa_+\leftarrow\kappa(u_k)_{j+}$; $j_-\leftarrow\arg\min_{i=1,\ldots,m}\kappa(u_k)_i$, $\kappa_-\leftarrow\kappa(u_k)_{j-}$;$\epsilon_+\leftarrow\frac{\kappa_+}{n}-1,\epsilon_-\leftarrow1-\frac{\kappa_-}{n}$, $\epsilon_k\leftarrow\max\{\epsilon_+,\epsilon_-\}$;

Step 2. if $\epsilon_k=\epsilon_+$, then $\lambda_k=\frac{\kappa_j-n}{n(\kappa_j-1)}$,$u_{k+1}\leftarrow u_k+\lambda_k(e_{j+}-u_k)$, else $\lambda_k=\min\{\frac{n-\kappa_j}{n(\kappa_j-1)},\frac{u_{j-}}{1-u_{j-}}\}$, $u_{k+1}\leftarrow u_k+\lambda_k(u_k-e_{j-})$;

Step 3. Output $u^*=u_k$;

There are certain noteworthy points about the WA algorithm proposed by Todd and Yildirim. (2007)

1. In the k-th iteration, some of the m points fall inside the ellipsoid, corresponding to $x_i^T(XUX^T)^{-1}x_i \le n$, while the other points fall outside of the ellipsoid, corresponding to $x_i^T(XUX^T)^{-1}x_i > n$. The goal of the current iteration is to make each element of the gradient of the objective function (i.e., $x_i^T(XUX^T)^{-1}x_i$) as close to n as possible until $(1-\epsilon)n \le x_i^T(XUX^T)^{-1}x_i \le (1+\epsilon)n$ holds for each i.

2. Choose an $i \in I$ and set $u^\dagger = u + \lambda(e_i - u)$, where $\{x_i | i \in I\}$ denotes the set of points outside the ellipsoid currently. The equality $x_i^T(XU^\dagger X^T)^{-1}x_i = n$, or equivalently,

$$x_i^T[(1-\lambda)XUX^T + \lambda x_i x_i^T]^{-1}x_i = n,$$

yields $\lambda = \frac{\kappa(u_k)_i - n}{n(\kappa(u_k)_i - 1)}$, which is consistent with the precise step size λ obtained in Khachiyan's algorithm.

This λ can guarantee the selected point x_i to fall on the boundary of the ellipsoid in the next iteration. Similarly, if the selected point x_j is inside the ellipsoid, choosing $\lambda = \frac{n - \kappa(u_k)_j}{n(\kappa(u_k)_j - 1)}$ as the step size also makes the point x_j satisfy $x_j^T H(u^\dagger)x_j = n$ in the next iteration, i.e., fall on the boundary of the ellipsoid in the subsequent iteration. In this way, each component of the gradient of the objective function asymptotically approaches to n.

3. In order to compute the initial gradient $\kappa(u_0)$, we can resort to the scaled Cholesky factorization with $\frac{1}{3}n^3$ arithmetic operations to obtain $XUX^T = \phi LL^T$. On one hand it is convenient to compute $(XUX^T)^{-1}$ via the Cholesky factorization. On the other hand, the Cholesky factorization of $(XU^\dagger X^T)$ corresponding to the next iteration point $u^\dagger$ can be obtained through Cholesky rank-one modification formula: $\frac{\phi}{1-\lambda}(XU^\dagger X^T) = LL^T + \frac{\lambda}{1-\lambda}\phi x_j x_j^T$. In addition, it is also convenient to update the inverse matrix $(XU^\dagger X^T)^{-1}$ via the rank-one modification formula. Specifically:

$$\begin{aligned}(XU^\dagger X^T)^{-1} &= ((1-\lambda)XUX^T + \lambda x_j x_j^T)^{-1} \\ &= \tfrac{1}{1-\lambda}[(XUX^T)^{-1} + \tfrac{\lambda}{1+\lambda(\kappa(u)_j - 1)}(XUX^T)^{-1}x_j x_j^T(XUX^T)^{-1}]\end{aligned}$$

Assume we have performed the scaled Cholesky decomposition on XUX^T, then it is easy to obtain $\hat{x}_j = (XUX^T)^{-1}x_j$ with $2n^2$ arithmetic operations, so that the gradient in the next iteration $\kappa(u^\dagger)_i = \frac{1}{1-\lambda}[\kappa(u)_i + \frac{\lambda(x_i^T\hat{x}_j)^2}{1+\lambda(\kappa(u)_j - 1)}]$ can be computed explicitly.

3. Coordinate Descent Algorithm

3.1. Coordinate Descent Algorithm

In this paper we propose a new first-order oracle (FOO) algorithm (i.e., the Adjusted Coordinate Descent algorithm) to address the MVEE problem. First, several relevant definitions needed in the subsequent text, such as smoothness, strong convexity, and coordinate-wise smoothness are given as follows.

DEFINITION 3. A continuously differentiable function $f(x)$ is said to be L-smooth on $\mathbb{R}^n$ if there exists a constant $L>0$ such that for any $x,y\in\mathbb{R}^n$ we have $\|\nabla f(x)-\nabla f(y)\|\le L\|x-y\|$. Here L is called the smoothness parameter.

DEFINITION 4. A continuously differentiable function $f(x)$ is said to be μ-strongly convex on $\mathbb{R}^n$ if there exists a constant $\mu>0$ such that for any $x,y\in\mathbb{R}^n$ we have $\|\nabla f(x)-\nabla f(y)\|\ge\mu\|x-y\|$. Here μ is called the convexity parameter.

DEFINITION 5. A continuously differentiable function $f(x)$ is said to be coordinate-wise smooth with smoothness parameter L_i if there exists $L_i>0$ such that for any $x\in\mathbb{R}^n$, $\theta_i\in\mathbb{R}$, we have $|\nabla_i f(x+\theta_i e_i)-\nabla_i f(x)|\le L_i|\theta_i|$, $i=1,\ldots,n$.

In the following, we discuss the properties of the objective function of model (D).

LEMMA 1. *Let u be a feasible solution of model (D), $\kappa(u)=\nabla_u g(u)$, and $\kappa(u)_i$ is the ith coordinate of $\kappa(u)$, then:*

(a) The objective function $g(u)$ is smooth and strongly convex with respect to $dom(g)\cap\triangle$, that is, there exists positive and finite L and μ such that: $\mu\|u-v\|\le\|\kappa(u)-\kappa(v)\|\le L\|u-v\|$,$\forall u,v\in dom(g)\cap\triangle$;

(b) $\forall\theta_i\ge 0$, $i=1,\ldots,m$, we have $|\kappa(u+\theta_i e_i)_i-\kappa(u)_i|\le(\kappa(u)_i)^2|\theta_i|$. For all θ_i satisfying $\frac{\kappa(u)_i-n}{\kappa(u)_i n}\le\theta_i\le 0$ with $\kappa(u)_i\le n$, we have $|\kappa(u+\theta_i e_i)_i-\kappa(u)_i|\le n\kappa(u)_i|\theta_i|$.

Proof of Lemma 1. (a) Since u is a feasible solution and $\nabla^2 g(u)$ is the Hadmard product of two positive definite matrices, $\nabla^2 g(u)$ is also a positive definite matrix. Thus, in order to prove (a),

we only need to show the existence of positive and finite L and μ such that $\mu I_n \preceq \nabla^2 g(u) \preceq L I_n$, $\forall u \in \mathrm{dom}(g) \cap \triangle$. If all the eigenvalues of the matrix $\nabla^2 g(u)$ are finite, the conclusion can be drawn by setting μ as the smallest eigenvalue and L as the largest eigenvalue over $\mathrm{dom}(g) \cap \triangle$. For this purpose, consider the problem $\max_{u\in\triangle} \lambda(\nabla^2 g(u))$, where $\lambda(\nabla^2 g(u))$ represents the eigenvalue of the matrix $\nabla^2 g(u)$. Since $\triangle$ is a compact set, and $\lambda(\nabla^2 g(u))$ is a continuous function, by Weierstrass's Theorem, $\lambda_{\max}(\nabla^2 g(u))$ is finite. Similarly, the smallest eigenvalue of $\nabla^2 g(u)$ also exists.

(b) For $\theta_i \geq 0$, by the definition of $\nabla g(u)$, and the Sherrman-Morrison-Woodbury formula, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|\kappa(u+\theta_i e_i)_i - \kappa(u)_i| &= |x_i^T (XUX^T + \theta_i x_i x_i^T)^{-1} x_i - x_i^T (XUX^T)^{-1} x_i| \\
&= |x_i^T (\tfrac{-\theta_i (XUX^T)^{-1} x_i x_i^T (XUX^T)^{-1}}{1+\theta_i \kappa(u)_i}) x_i| \\
&= \tfrac{\theta_i (\kappa(u)_i)^2}{1+\theta_i \kappa(u)_i} \\
&\leq (\kappa(u)_i)^2 |\theta_i|.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, for $\frac{\kappa(u)_i - n}{\kappa(u)_i n} \leq \theta_i \leq 0$ with $\kappa(u)_i \leq n$, we have $\frac{\kappa(u)_i^2}{1+\kappa(u)_i \theta_i} \leq \kappa(u)_i n$, and it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
|\kappa(u+\theta_i e_i)_i - \kappa(u)_i| &= |x_i^T (XUX^T + \theta_i x_i x_i^T)^{-1} x_i - x_i^T (XUX^T)^{-1} x_i| \\
&= |x_i^T (\tfrac{-\theta_i (XUX^T)^{-1} x_i x_i^T (XUX^T)^{-1}}{1+\theta_i \kappa(u)_i}) x_i| \\
&= \tfrac{\theta_i \kappa(u)_i^2}{1+\theta_i \kappa(u)_i} \\
&\leq n \kappa(u)_i |\theta_i|.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Part (a) of Lemma 1 shows the smoothness and strong convexity of the objective function $g(u)$. It reveals not only the possibility of global linear convergence of the FW type algorithms, but also the possibility of introducing the FOO algorithm to compute the MVEE problem. However, this possibility does not mean that the FOO algorithm can be applied directly to solve model (D) for two reasons.

The first reason is that we cannot always guarantee the positive definiteness of the matrix XUX^T. Note that XUX^T is at least a positive semi-definite matrix, and $\forall 0 \neq y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $y^T (XUX^T) y = \sum_{\{i|u_i>0\}} \|y^T x_i\|^2 = 0$, we have $y \perp x_i, \forall i \in I = \{i | u_i > 0\}$. It follows that if $aff\{x_i | i \in I\} = \mathbb{R}^n$, then such y dose not exist, and XUX^T is always positive definite.

As for the FW type algorithms, no matter we choose the Khachiyan initialization scheme ($u_0 = \{\frac{1}{m}, \ldots, \frac{1}{m}\}$), or the Kumar-Yildirim initialization scheme (non-zero element in u_0 represents n's linearly independent directions), the initialization of u_0 satisfies the positive definiteness of XU_0X^T. Moreover, since the new iteration point u_{k+1} is the convex combination of the current iteration point u_k and e_j, where j is the selected coordinate, the number of nonzero elements in u_{k+1} will not decrease with respect to u_k, $\forall k$. As a result, XU_kX^T is positive definite, $\forall k$. However, for the FOO algorithm, e.g., the gradient projection algorithm, the projection to the probability simplex is equivalent to finding one λ such that $\sum_{j=1}^{m} \max\{u_j - \lambda, 0\} = 1$(see Boyd and Vandenberghe. (2004)), and each element of the new iteration point u_{k+1} is $u_{k+1}^j = \max\{u_k^j - \lambda, 0\}$, $j = 1, \ldots, m$. It follows that the number of nonzero elements in u_{k+1} might be less than n. As a result, simply using the gradient projection method does not guarantee the positive definiteness of XU_kX^T.

The second reason is that the step size of the FOO algorithm might be arbitrarily small and it will make no contribution to the improvement of the objective function during each iteration. Since the L and μ mentioned in part (a) of Lemma 1 are dependent on the point set X, the value of the L and μ might be huge. Furthermore, in part (a) we did not give specific values of the L and μ, which presents difficulties in computing.

Part (b) of Lemma 1 presents a kind of coordinate-wise property of the objective function $g(u)$, which is weaker than the coordinate-wise smoothness. Using this property, we can explain the FW-K algorithm from a new perspective. Kumar and Yildirim. (2005) explained the FW-K algorithm as follows: each iteration step of the FW-K algorithm is improving toward the direction of the point with the largest ellipsoidal norm ($\|\cdot\|_H$, where $H = XU_kX^T$). Sun and Freund. (2004) treated the ellipsoidal center as the mean value of the point set X, and the $\|\cdot\|_H$ distance of a point in the ellipsoid to the ellipsoidal center as the variance of the point. Thus, each iteration step of the FW-K algorithm is improving towards the direction of the point with the largest variance. Part (b) shows that the objective function g is $L_i = \kappa(u)_i^2$ coordinate-wise smooth when $\theta_i \geq 0$, $i = 1, \ldots, m$. Notice that in each iteration, the FW-K algorithm chooses the coordinate axis i with the largest value

of $\kappa(u)^i$, which corresponds to the coordinate axis with the worst smoothness. This coordinate selection scheme is similar to that of the randomized coordinate descent method (RCDM) proposed by Nesterov. (2011), that is, the worse smoothness the coordinate axis is, the more likely it is to be selected in the next iteration. Therefore, the coordinate selection scheme of the FW-K algorithm and the RCDM on the MVEE problem are consistent in a sense. This consistency relates the linear optimization oracle (LOO) algorithm to the FOO algorithm.

Based on the result of Lemma 1, this paper proposes a new FOO algorithm, the Adjusted Coordinate Descent (ACD) algorithm, to solve model $(D^{'})$ instead of model (D) so as to compute the MVEE. Denoting $h(u) = g(u) + n(1 - e^T u)$ as the objective function of model $(D^{'})$, the ACD algorithm is:

ACD algorithm for model (D')

Input. $X = \{x_1, \ldots, x_m\}$, $\epsilon > 0$;

Step 0. Using Khachiyan's or Kumar - Yildirim's initialize scheme to initialize u_0;

Step 1. $j_+ \leftarrow \arg\max_{i=1,\ldots,m} \kappa(u_k)_i$, $\kappa_+ \leftarrow \kappa(u_k)_{j+}$; $j_- \leftarrow \arg\min_{i=1,\ldots,m} \kappa(u_k)_i$, $\kappa_- \leftarrow \kappa(u_k)_{j-}$;

Step 2. While not converged, if $\epsilon > \max\{\frac{\kappa_+ - n}{n}, \frac{n - \kappa_-}{n}\}$, then exit; else if $\frac{\kappa_+ - n}{n} > \frac{n - \kappa_-}{n}$, then $\lambda = \frac{\kappa_+ - n}{\kappa_+^2}$, $u_{k+1} = u_k + \lambda e_{j+}$; else $\lambda = \max\{-u_{j-}, \frac{\kappa_- - n}{\kappa_- n}\}$, $u_{k+1} = u_k + \lambda e_{j-}$;

Step 3. Output $u^* = u_k$;

There are several points needed to be explained with regard to the ACD algorithm.

1. Let u and $u^\dagger$ denote two successive iteration points of the ACD algorithm, then we have:

$$u^\dagger = \begin{cases} u + \frac{\kappa_+ - n}{\kappa_+^2} e_{j+}, & \text{if } j+ \text{is chosen} \\ P_{\{u|u \geq 0\}}(u + \frac{\kappa_- - n}{n\kappa_-} e_{j-}), & \text{if } j- \text{is chosen} \end{cases}$$

Notice that the ACD algorithm aims to compute model $(D^{'})$ whose objective function is $h(u)$ with the gradient $\nabla h(u) = ne - \kappa(u)$ satisfying $|\nabla_i h(u + \theta_i e_i) - \nabla_i h(u)| = |\kappa(u + \theta_i e_i)_i - \kappa(u)_i|$. From part (b) of Lemma 1, we know that if the $(j+)$th coordinate axis is selected, then $|\nabla_{j+} h(u^\dagger) - \nabla_{j+} h(u)| \leq \kappa_+^2 |u_{j+}^\dagger - u_{j+}|$, and if the $(j-)$-th coordinate axis is selected, then $|\nabla_{j-} h(u^\dagger) - \nabla_{j-} h(u)| \leq n\kappa_- |u_{j-}^\dagger - u_{j-}|$. Hence, the objective function $h(u)$ of model $(D^{'})$ is coordinate-wise smooth with respect to any two successive iteration points generated by the ACD algorithm.

2. When the $(j+)$th coordinate axis is selected, the iteration step is equivalent to the "add-" and "plus-" iteration step in Todd and Yildirim. (2007). Since $\kappa_+ > n$, we have the step size $\lambda = \frac{\kappa_+ - n}{\kappa_+^2} > 0$. Hence, the value of the $(j+)$th element of u_{k+1} increases with respect to u_k, while the other elements remain unchanged. Moreover, as κ_+^2 is the $(j+)$th smoothness parameter L_{j+} of the objective function $h(u)$, and $n - \kappa_+ \leq 0$ is the $(j+)$th element of $\nabla h(u)$, the successive point generated by the ACD algorithm can be written as $u^\dagger = P_{\{u|u\geq 0\}}(u - \frac{1}{L_{j+}}\nabla h(u)_{j+})$ for the "add-" and "plus-" iteration step.

3. When the $(j-)$th coordinate axis is selected, the iteration step is equivalent to the "minus-" and "drop-" iteration step in Todd and Yildirim. (2007). Specifically, in case $\frac{\kappa_- - n}{\kappa_-^2} > -u_{j-}$, the iteration step is "minus-". Notice that the $(j-)$th smoothness parameter L_{j-} can be expanded to $\kappa_{j-} n$, thus the successive point is equivalent to $u^\dagger = P_{\{u|u\geq 0\}}(u - \frac{1}{L_{j-}}\nabla h(u)_{j-})$. On the other hand, in case $\frac{\kappa_- - n}{\kappa_-^2} < -u_{j-}$, the iteration step is "drop-", and the $(j-)$th element is decreased to 0. Therefore, the successive point can also be expressed as $u^\dagger = P_{\{u|u\geq 0\}}(u - \frac{1}{L_{j-}}\nabla h(u)_{j-})$.

4. In the "add-" and "plus-" iteration step, since $\kappa(u^\dagger)_{j+} - \kappa(u)_{j+} = \frac{(n-\kappa_+)\kappa_+}{2\kappa_+ - n} < 0$, we can only guarantee that $x_{j+}^T(XU^\dagger X^T)x_{j+} \leq x_{j+}^T(XUX^T)x_{j+}$, while we can not guarantee that the value of $x_{j+}^T(XU^\dagger X^T)x_{j+}$ can be decreased to n. However, if the step size is set as $\lambda = \frac{n-\kappa_+}{n\kappa_+}$, $x_{j+}^T(XU^\dagger X^T)x_{j+}$ can be reduced to n. Unfortunately, since $\kappa_+ > n$, $n\kappa_+$ is not the smoothness parameter of the $(j+)$th coordinate.

LEMMA 2. *Let $u^\dagger$ be the next iteration point of u generated by the ACD algorithm, then:*

$$h(u) - h(u^\dagger) \geq \begin{cases} \frac{(n-\kappa_+)^2}{2\kappa_+^2}, & \text{if } j+ \text{ is chosen} \\ \frac{(n-\kappa_-)^2}{2n\kappa_-}, & \text{if } j- \text{ is chosen and } \frac{n-\kappa_-}{\kappa_- n} < u_{j-} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof of Lemma 2. First we notice that with respect to the two successive points generated by the ACD algorithm, the objective function $h(u)$ is $\kappa(u)_{j+}^2$ coordinate-wise smooth when coordinate $j+$ is selected, and $n\kappa(u)_{j-}$ coordinate-wise smooth when coordinate $j-$ is selected. By the above

relation and the fact that $\nabla_i h(u) = n - \kappa(u)_i$, we have $u^\dagger = u - \frac{n-\kappa_+}{\kappa_+^2} e_{j+}$ if the current iteration chooses the $(j+)$th coordinate. Using the smoothness inequality (Nesterov. (2004)), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} h(u^\dagger) &\leq h(u) - (n-\kappa_+)\tfrac{n-\kappa_+}{\kappa_+^2} + \tfrac{\kappa_+^2}{2}\tfrac{(n-\kappa_+)^2}{\kappa_+^4}, \\ &= h(u) - \tfrac{(n-\kappa_+)^2}{2(\kappa_+)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

If the current iteration chooses the $(j-)$th coordinate, we have $u^\dagger = P_{\{u|u\geq 0\}}(u - \frac{n-\kappa_-}{\kappa_- n} e_{j-})$, and from the famous projection theorem (Bertsekas. (2015)), we have

$$(u - \frac{n-\kappa_-}{\kappa_- n} e_{j-} - u^\dagger)^T (u - u^\dagger) \leq 0,$$

i.e., $(n-\kappa_-) e_{j-}^T (u^\dagger - u) \leq -(\kappa_- n)\|u - u^\dagger\|^2$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} h(u^\dagger) &\leq h(u) - (n\kappa_-)\|u-u^\dagger\|^2 + \tfrac{(n\kappa_-)}{2}\|u-u^\dagger\|^2 \\ &= h(u) - \tfrac{n\kappa_-}{2}\|u-u^\dagger\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Here, in case $\frac{n-\kappa_-}{\kappa_- n} < u_{j-}$, we have $\|u-u^\dagger\|^2 = \frac{1}{(n\kappa_-)^2}(n-\kappa_-)^2$, and therefore:

$$\begin{aligned} h(u^\dagger) &\leq h(u) - \tfrac{n\kappa_-}{2}\tfrac{1}{(n\kappa_-)^2}(n-\kappa_-)^2 \\ &\leq h(u) - \tfrac{(n-\kappa_-)^2}{2(n\kappa_-)}. \end{aligned}$$

In case $\frac{n-\kappa_-}{\kappa_- n} \geq u_{j-}$, since the value of $\|u-u^\dagger\|^2$ might be arbitrarily small, it can only be guaranteed that:

$$h(u^\dagger) \leq h(u).$$

□

Lemma 2 shows that the ACD algorithm generates a sequence of relaxation points (Nesterov. (2004)) which provides a good condition for the convergence analysis. Indeed, let $u^\dagger = u + \lambda e_i$, then $h(u) - h(u^\dagger) = \ln(1 + \lambda\kappa(u)_i) - n\lambda$. Therefore, if we choose the $(j+)$th coordinate in the current iteration, i.e., $i = j+$, $\lambda = \frac{\kappa_+ - n}{\kappa_+^2}$, then:

$$h(u) - h(u^\dagger) = \ln(2 - \frac{n}{\kappa_+}) - \frac{n(\kappa_+ - n)}{\kappa_+^2},$$

which can be proved to be greater than $\frac{(n-\kappa_+)^2}{2\kappa_+^2}$.

If we choose the $(j-)$th coordinate in the current iteration and $\frac{\kappa_- - n}{n\kappa_-} \geq -u_{j-}$, i.e., $i = j-$, $\lambda = \frac{\kappa_- - n}{n\kappa_-}$, then:

$$h(u) - h(u^\dagger) = \ln(\frac{\kappa_-}{n}) + \frac{n}{\kappa_-} - 1,$$

which can be proved to be greater than $\frac{(n-\kappa_-)^2}{2n\kappa_-}$.

If we choose the $(j-)$th coordinate in the current iteration and $\frac{\kappa_- - n}{n\kappa_-} < -u_{j-}$, i.e., $i = j-$, $\lambda = -u_{j-}$, then :

$$h(u) - h(u^\dagger) = nu_{j-} + \ln(1 - u_{j-}\kappa_-),$$

which can be proved to be greater than 0(see Appendix).

Considering the new vector norm proposed in Nesterov. (2011), we can further obtain the smoothness property of the objective function $h(u)$. As $\kappa(u)_i \to \infty$ if and only if there exists at least a $u_i \to \infty$, we know $\min_{u\geq 0}\{\min\{\kappa(u)_i, \sqrt{n\kappa(u)_i}\}\}$ exists, $\forall i = 1, \ldots, m$. Without loss of generality, let $M_i = \min_{u\geq 0}\{\min\{\kappa(u)_i, \sqrt{n\kappa(u)_i}\}\}$, $i = 1, \ldots, m$. Then according to Nesterov. (2011), for vectors x and f,

$$\|x\|_{Nes-\alpha} = (\sum_{i=1}^{m}(M_i^{-2\alpha}(|x_i|^2)))^{\frac{1}{2}} \; and$$
$$\|f\|^*_{Nes-\alpha} = (\sum_{i=1}^{m}(M_i^{2\alpha}(|f_i|^2)))^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

satisfy the definition of norm and are dual to each other. The following lemma states that when only the "add-", "plus-" and "minus-" iteration steps are taken into consideration, we can obtain the smoothness of the objective function $h(u)$.

LEMMA 3. *Regarding the "add-", "plus-" and "minus-" iteration steps, the objective function $h(u)$ is m-smooth with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_{Nes-1}$ norm.*

Proof of Lemma 3. Let h^* denote the optimal value of the objective function $h(u)$. Consider the functions $f_1(t) = \frac{(n-t)^2}{2t^2}$ and $f_2(t) = \frac{(n-t)^2}{2tn}$. When $t \geq n$, $f_1(t)$ is monotonically increasing and when $t \leq n$, $f_2(t)$ is monotonically decreasing. By Lemma 2 we have:

$$\begin{aligned} h(u) - h^* &\geq h(u) - h(u^\dagger) \\ &\geq \max_{i=1,\ldots,m} \frac{(n-\kappa(u)_i)^2}{2M_i} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2m}\sum_{i=1}^{m}\frac{1}{M_i}(n-\kappa(u)_i)^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2m}\|\nabla(h(u))\|^2_{Nes-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

Moreover, let $\phi(u) = h(u) - h(v) - \kappa(v)^T(u-v)$, and it follows that $\nabla_i\phi(u) = n - \kappa(u)_i - \kappa(v)_i$. Hence, for any two successive points u and $u^\dagger$ generated by the ACD algorithm, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla_i\phi(u^\dagger) - \nabla_i\phi(u)| &= |\kappa(u^\dagger)_i - \kappa(u)_i| \\ &\le L_i|u_i^\dagger - u_i|, \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where $i = j+, L_i = \kappa_+^2$ or $i = j-, L_i = n\kappa_-$. Thereby, $\phi(\cdot)$ is also coordinate-wise smooth for any two successive points u and $u^\dagger$. In addition, as v is the minimum point of $\phi(u)$ in $\mathbb{R}^m$, it follows from equation (4) that

$$\begin{aligned} h(u) - h(v) - \kappa(v)^T(u-v) &= \phi(u) \\ &= \phi(u) - \phi(v) \\ &\ge \tfrac{1}{2m}\|\nabla\phi(u)\|_{Nes-1}^2 \\ &\ge \tfrac{1}{2m}\|\kappa(u) - \kappa(v)\|_{Nes-1}^2, \end{aligned}$$

and the lemma follows. □

Since the WA algorithm resorts to the "scaled Cholesky decomposition" when computing the inverse matrix of XU_kX^T (with reference to Todd. (2016)), it also needs more arithmetic operations in rank-one modification of Cholesky decomposition of XUX^T and updating $\kappa_j, j = 1, \ldots, m$ during each iteration. Therefore, in certain cases, when the number of iterations is relatively large, the computing time of the WA algorithm exceeds that of the ACD algorithm, even though the number of iterations of the ACD algorithm is slightly more than that of the WA algorithm.

There are two key facts we shall notice about Lemma 3:

1. First, if we only consider the add-, plus- and minus-iterations, the objective function $h(u)$ of model (D') is smooth on the domain $\{u|u \ge 0\}$, which plays an important role in the proof of the convergence. In Lemma 3, the smoothness property is proved without using Weierstrass's Theorem, since the feasible domain of (D') is unbounded.

2. We recall from Lemma 1 that although the objective function of model (D) is both smooth and strongly convex, the smoothness parameter and the convexity parameter are not known, which makes the FOO algorithm difficult to design and analyze. However, Lemma 3 stated that $h(u)$ is m-smooth with respect to the norm $\|\cdot\|_{Nes-1}$.

Next we shall show the coercivity of $h(u)$.

LEMMA 4. *The objective function $h(u)$ of model (D') is coercive over the set $\{u|u \geq 0\}$.*

Proof of Lemma 4. By the definition of coercivity, to show that $h(u) \to \infty$ when $u \geq 0$ and $\|u\| \to \infty$ is enough. It is easy to see that $\|u\| \to \infty$ if and only if at least one coordinate u_i of u satisfies that $u_i \to \infty$. As $h(u^{'}) = -\ln\det(XUX^T) - \ln(1 + t\kappa(u)_i) + n(e^T u - 1) + nt$, where $u^{'} = u + t \cdot e_i$, we know $h(u^{'}) \to \infty$ when $t \to \infty$. This completes the proof. $\square$

From Lemma 4, we know that although the feasible domain of the model (D') is unbounded, we can restrict the attention into a compact set $dom(h) \cap \{u|u \geq 0\}$. Hence $h(u)$ is strongly convex with respect to L_2 norm on the set $\{u \geq 0\}$ as $\nabla^2 h(u)$ is continuous. Without loss of generality, we denote $h(u)$ as μ-strongly convex with respect to the norm $\|\cdot\|_{Nes-1}$.

Combining the Lemmas 2, 3 and 4, we can not only show the convergence of the ACD algorithm but also prove the global linear convergence rate of it.

THEOREM 1. *The ACD algorithm is linear convergent.*

Proof. By Lemma 3, if we only consider the add-, plus- and minus-iterations,

$$h(u_k) - h(u_{k+1}) \geq \frac{1}{2m}\|\nabla h(u_k)\|^2_{Nes-1}.$$

As $h(u)$ is μ-strongly convex and m-smooth on the set $\{u|u \geq 0\}$ with respect to the norm $\|\cdot\|_{Nes-1}$, we have

$$h(u) \geq h(v) + \nabla h(v)^T(u - v) + \frac{\mu}{2}\|u - v\|^2_{Nes-1}, \forall u, v \in \{u|u \geq 0\} \cap \mathrm{dom}h. \tag{5}$$

Denoting $u = u_k$, and minimizing both sides of the inequality (5) with respect to v, we have:

$$h(u_k) - h^* \leq \frac{1}{2\mu}\|\nabla h(u_k)\|^2_{Nes-1}. \tag{6}$$

Combining inequalities (4) and (5), we can obtain

$$h(u_k) - h(u_{k+1}) \geq \frac{\mu}{m}(h(u_k) - h^*)$$

and thus

$$h(u_{k+1}) - h^* \leq (1 - \frac{\mu}{m})(h(u_k) - h^*).$$

Therefore, the total number of the add-, plus- and minus-iterations is $k = \alpha + \beta \ln(\frac{1}{\epsilon})$, where $\alpha = \frac{\ln(h(u_0)-h^*)}{\ln(1-\frac{\mu}{m})}$, $\beta = \frac{1}{\ln(1-\frac{\mu}{m})}$.

As for the drop-iterations, they can be paired with a previous iteration where either $u_{k_{j+}}$ was increased from zero, or $u_{k_{j-}}$ is decreased to zero for the first time which was positive at the initial iteration (Ahipasaoglu et al.(2008) and Todd (2016)). From this we know that the number of the drop-iterations can be at most the sum of k and the number of nonzero coordinates of u_0, which is $2n$ under Kumar-Yildirim's initialization scheme, and m under Khachiyan's initialization scheme.

Then it can be concluded that the total number of iterations is at most $2(\alpha+\beta \ln(\frac{1}{\epsilon}))+\sigma$, where $\sigma = m$ or $2n$. This means that the convergence rate is linear. □

Ahipasaoglu et al.(2008) and Todd (2016) only proved the local linear convergence of the FW type algorithms on the MVEE problem. Here we have shown that the ACD algorithm is linearly convergent regardless of the initial point. An interesting byproduct of Theorem 1 is that the FW type algorithm is also globally linearly convergent. In what follows we take the WA algorithm as an example. First, we will need two lemmas.

LEMMA 5. *(a) Denoting* $\phi(t) = (n-1)\ln\frac{(n-1)t}{n(t-1)} + \ln\frac{t^2}{n(2t-n)} - \frac{(n-t)n}{t^2}$, *when* $t \geq n$, $\phi(t) \geq 0$;

(b) Denoting $\psi(t) = (n-1)\ln\frac{(n-1)t}{n(t-1)} - \frac{n}{t} + 1$, *when* $1 \leq t \leq n$, $\psi(t) \geq 0$.

proof (a)$\phi(n) = 0$. The equation $\phi'(t) = 0$ has two complex roots, which can be omitted here, and two real roots, which are $t_1 = n$ and $t_2 < n$ respectively. This means that when $t \geq n$, the function $\phi(t)$ is monotone, By calculation we can find that $\phi(t)$ is nondecreasing when $t \geq n$, indicating $\phi(t) \geq 0$ when $t \geq n$.

(b) $\psi(n) = 0$. $\psi'(t) = \frac{t-n}{t^3-t^2} \leq 0$ when $1 \leq t \leq n$. As a result, $\psi(t)$ is monotone decreasing when $1 \leq t \leq n$, indicating $\psi(t) \geq 0$ when $1 \leq t \leq n$. □

LEMMA 6. *If the coordinate to be iterated is* $j-$, κ_- *generated by the FW type algorithm or the ACD algorithm is in the interval* $(1, n)$.

proof From Todd(2016), the objective function $h(u)$ decreases by $(n-1)\ln\frac{(n-1)\kappa_-}{n(\kappa_--1)}+\ln\frac{\kappa_-}{n}$ each iteration in the FW type algorithm, we know $1<\kappa_-<n$.

For the ACD algorithm, assume the contrary, i.e., the coordinate to be iterated is $j-$ and $0<\kappa_-<1$. From the Sherman-Morrison-Woodbury formula, we obtain that $h(u)$ decreases by $\Delta^{ACD}=\ln\frac{\kappa_-}{n}+\frac{n}{\kappa_-}-1, 0\le\kappa_-\le 1$. Denoting u_k as the current point, the distance from $h(u_k)$ to the optimal value is(Todd(2016)):

$$\begin{aligned} h(u_k)-h^* &= n\ln(1+\tfrac{n-\kappa_-}{n}) \\ &= n\ln(2-\tfrac{\kappa_-}{n}), \end{aligned}$$

where $0\le\kappa_-\le 1$. We shall show that $h(u_k)-h^*\le\Delta^{ACD}$ to arrive at a contradiction.

Denoting $\Phi(\kappa_-)=(h(u_k)-h^*)-\Delta^{ACD}=n\ln(2-\frac{\kappa_-}{n})-\ln\frac{\kappa_-}{n}-\frac{n}{\kappa_-}+1, 0\le\kappa_-\le 1$, on one hand we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi'(\kappa_-) &= \tfrac{-n}{2n-\kappa_-}-\tfrac{1}{\kappa_-}+\tfrac{n^2}{\kappa_-^2}, \\ &= \tfrac{(1-n)\kappa_-^2-n\kappa_--2n^2}{\kappa_-^2(2n-\kappa_-)}. \end{aligned}$$

As $0\le\kappa_-\le 1$, we claim that $\Phi'(\kappa_-)\ge 0$. Trivially, the denominator is greater than 0. And the numerator is a second order concave function with two real roots $\kappa_-^1=\frac{3n+\sqrt{n^2+8n^3}}{2}>1$ and $\kappa_-^2=\frac{3n-\sqrt{n^2+8n^3}}{2}\le\frac{3n-\sqrt{n^2+8n^2}}{2}=0$ respectively, meaning that when $0\le\kappa_-\le 1$, the numerator is also greater than 0.). This indicates that $\Phi(\kappa_-)$ is monotone increasing when $0\le\kappa_-\le 1$.

On the other hand, as $\Phi(1)=n\ln(2-\frac{1}{n})-\ln\frac{1}{n}-n+1<0$ when $n>3$, we know $\Phi(\kappa_-)\le\Phi(1)<0$ when $0\le\kappa_-\le 1$, which means that $\Delta^{ACD}\ge h(u_k)-h^*$, a contradiction. As a result, we always have $1<\kappa_-<n$ if $j-$ is chosen in the ACD algorithm. □

THEOREM 2. *The WA algorithm is globally linearly convergent.*

proof Considering only the add-, plus- and minus-iterations, by Todd (2016), the objective function $g(u)$ decreases by $g^{WA}(u^\dagger)-g^{WA}(u)\ge(n-1)\ln(\frac{(n-1)\delta}{n(\delta-1)})+\ln(\frac{\delta}{n})$ in each iteration of the WA algorithm, where $i=j+$ or $j-$, $\delta>1$. Specifically, $\delta=\frac{\kappa_+-n}{n}$ if the coordinate $j+$ is chosen for iteration, while $\delta=\frac{n-\kappa_-}{n}$ if the coordinate $j-$ is chosen. In the WA algorithm, $e^Tu=e^Tu^\dagger=1$, hence $h^{WA}(u^\dagger)-h^{WA}(u)=g^{WA}(u^\dagger)-g^{WA}(u)$. Combined with Lemma 2, we know that the difference

between the decrement of the objective function by the WA algorithm and the ACD algorithm can be simplified as

$$\phi(\kappa_+) = (n-1)\ln\frac{(n-1)\kappa_+}{n(\kappa_+-1)} + \ln\frac{\kappa_+^2}{n(2\kappa_+-n)} - \frac{(n-\kappa_+)n}{\kappa_+^2}$$

if the coordinate $j+$ is chosen for iteration, while the difference shall be

$$\psi(\kappa_-) = (n-1)\ln\frac{(n-1)\kappa_-}{n(\kappa_--1)} - \frac{n}{\kappa_-} + 1$$

if the coordinate $j-$ is chosen for iteration.

From Lemma 5, we have $\phi(\kappa_+) \geq 0$, and $\psi(\kappa_-) \geq 0$ if $1 \leq \kappa_- \leq n$. Together with Lemma 6, it follows that the decrement of the objective function of the WA algorithm can never be less than that of the ACD algorithm. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} h^{WA}(u) - h^{WA}(u^\dagger) &\geq h^{ACD}(u) - h^{ACD}(u^\dagger), \\ &\geq (\tfrac{\mu}{m})(h^{ACD}(u) - h^*), \\ &\geq (\tfrac{\mu}{m})(h^{WA}(u) - h^*), \end{aligned}$$

indicating that $h^{WA}(u^\dagger) - h^* \leq (1-\frac{\mu}{m})(h^{WA}(u) - h^*)$.

According to the property of the drop-iteration, the total number k of iterations in the WA algorithm is linear in $\ln\frac{1}{\epsilon}$, meaning that the WA algorithm is also linearly convergent. □

We note that although in Theorem 2 it is shown that the decrease of the objective function is larger in the WA algorithm than in the ACD algorithm, the ACD algorithm is more efficient than the WA algorithm as shown by the simulations, especially in the case with large dimensions, like $n = 500$. This means that in huge-scale data sets, the ACD algorithm is preferred. The details are in Section 4.

3.2. Complexity Analysis

The ACD algorithm consists of two stages, the initialization stage and the iteration stage. In the initialization stage, we shall calculate κ_j for each j after obtaining the initial point u_0 by Kumar-Yildirim's initialization scheme, whose complexity is $O(n^2m)$. In the calculation, first denote

$XU_0X^T = A^TA$, where A^T can be factorized as $A^T = Q_0R_0$ with Q_0 and R_0 being an orthogonal matrix and a upper-triangle matrix respectively. Then it can be obtained that

$$\begin{aligned}\kappa_j &= x_j^T(XU_0X^T)^{-1}x_j \\ &= x_j^T R_0^{-1}R_0^{-T}x_j \\ &= (R_0^{-T}x_j)^T(R_0^{-T}x_j),\end{aligned}$$

from which we can see that the calculation includes the following:

1. calculating $A^T = XU_0^{\frac{1}{2}}$ whose complexity is $O(mn)$,
2. the QR factorization of A^T whose complexity is $O(mn^2)$,
3. calculating R_0^{-T} whose complexity is $O(n^3)$,
4. calculating $R_0^{-T}x_j$ whose complexity is $O(n^2)$,
5. calculating $\kappa_j = (R_0^{-T}x_j)^T(R_0^{-T}x_j)$ whose complexity is $O(n)$.

As there are in total m different κ_j s, the total complexity of the initialization part is $O(mn^2) + O(m(mn + mn^2 + n^3 + n^2 + n)) = O(m^2n^2)$.

During the iterations, the calculations include

1. finding out the biggest and smallest among the κ_j,$j = 1, \ldots, m$, whose complexity is $O(m)$,
2. comparing $\frac{\kappa_+ - n}{n}$ and $\frac{n - \kappa_-}{n}$, whose complexity is $O(1)$,
3. calculating the step size λ and the next iteration point $u^\dagger$, whose complexity is $O(1)$,
4. adopting the Cholesky rank-one modification update $XU^\dagger X^T = XUX^T - \lambda x_j x_j^T$, whose complexity is $O(mn^2)$.

As the number of iterations is $O(\ln\frac{1}{\epsilon})$, the total complexity of this part is $O(\ln\frac{1}{\epsilon}(m + n^2 + mn^2)) = O(\ln\frac{1}{\epsilon}(mn^2))$. Adding these two parts together, the complexity of the ACD algorithm is $O(mn^2 \ln\frac{1}{\epsilon})$.

4. Numerical Tests

Extensive computational tests have been carried out and discussed in several research papers (with reference to Sun and Freund. (2004), Ahipasaoglu et al. (2008)). According to the most recently result by Todd. (2016), we know that

1. The WA algorithm achieves the most accurate solutions.

2. Kumar and Yildirim's initialization scheme truly accelerated the speed of computation.

3. The points elimination strategy used in Ahipasaoglu. (2009)) speeds up the computation.

4. On moderately sized samples (dimension ≤ 30, number of points ≤ 1800), when using the active set strategy, the DRN algorithms outperforms the other algorithms, while without the active set strategy, the WA algorithm outperforms the other algorithms. On large-scale samples (dimension ≤ 30, number of points $\leq 30{,}000$), the DRN method is superior. on huge-scale sized samples (dimension $= 500$, number of points $=500{,}000$), the WA algorithm is the only feasible algorithm, while the other methods failed because of the memory problem.

Based on the conclusion of Todd. (2016), in this section, we focus only on the efficiency of the WA algorithm and the ACD algorithm. The aim of this numerical test is trying to determine: (1) the efficiency of the WA algorithm and the ACD algorithm on various test samples, including small size samples, moderate size samples, large-scale size samples and huge-scale size samples; (2) whether the globally linear convergence really exhibits as proved in Theorems 2 and 3.

Test samples. According to Todd. (2016), if the test samples are generated from a general Gaussian distribution, they will all lie close to the surface of an ellipsoid, which is a special situation. Therefore, we use the point generating strategy of Todd. (2016) to build up our test sets.

Size. To compare the efficiencies of the WA algorithm and the ACD algorithm on various samples, we test the two algorithms with respect to 4 different sizes of data sets, which are: $n = 10, m = 500$ for small size test sets, $n = 30, m = 1800$ for moderate size test sets, $n = 100, m = 30,000$ for large-scale size test sets and $n = 500, m = 500,000$ for huge-scale size test sets. Moreover, in order to determine whether merely the dimension influences the efficiency of the ACD algorithm and the WA algorithm, we use two more test sets ($n = 500, m = 1000$ for a high dimension and small size data set (HDSN), while $n = 20, m = 100,000$ for a low dimension and large size data set (LDLN).

Parameters. According to Todd (2016), the WA algorithm with Kumar-Yilidirim's initialization scheme can achieve a high accuracy with the error bound being $\epsilon = 10^{-7}$, which is used here. With

respect to the initialization scheme, Kumar-Yilidirim's initialization scheme is used in this study, since it is superior both theoretically and practically.

The computational results of the ACD algorithm and the WA algorithm on different sizes of test sets are illustrated in Table 2. The experiments were performed 10 times for each situation.

With respect to the small size sample, the average iterations and computing time of the WA algorithm outperforms the ACD algorithm slightly. More specifically, 7 in 10 cases supports the superiority of the WA algorithm, especially in cases 6 and 7, while the remaining 3 cases supports the superiority of the ACD algorithm. It is noted that the efficiency of the two algorithms on the small scale sample are nearly equivalent to each other, and it follows that with respect to small data sets, these two algorithms are competent. With respect to the moderate size sample, the superiority of the WA algorithm seems to be more apparent, that is, the average iterations of the WA algorithm is 296.5, which is less than 362.7 average iterations of the ACD algorithm. More specifically, 8 in 10 cases supports the superiority of the WA algorithm, especially in cases 4 and 9. It is noted that although the average iterations of the WA algorithm is less than that of the ACD algorithm, the average computing time of the two algorithms are equivalent. The reason is that the WA algorithm resorts the scaled Cholesky factorization during each iteration, while the ACD algorithm resorts to the Cholesky factorization. It is obvious that the scaled Cholesky factorization needs more arithmetic operations than the Cholesky factorization. With respect to the large-scale size sample, the average iterations and computing time of the ACD algorithm are 731 and 0.52 seconds, respectively, less than 767.1 iterations and 0.57 seconds of the WA algorithm. It is noted that 10 cases all support the superiority of the ACD algorithm, and this superiority is much apparent. With respect to the huge-scale size sample, the superiority of the ACD algorithm is much more apparent. The results supports that the efficiency of the ACD algorithm outperforms that of the WA algorithm as the dimension of the data set is large.

Figure 1 shows the progress of $\max \kappa(u)_i$ and $\min\{\kappa(u)_j : u_j > 0\}$ under small (subplot 1), moderate (subplot 2), large-scale (subplot 3) and huge-scale(subplot 4) size samples, and the linear

Table 2 Performance of algorithms ACD, and WA on small, moderate, large-scale and huge-scale sized problem instances of the minimum volume enclosing ellipsoid problem.

Sample Size	Dimension		Algorithm			
			ACD Algorithm		WA Algorithm	
	n	m	Iterations	Solution Time (seconds)	Iterations	Solution Time (seconds)
Small Size	10	500	96	0*	88	0
	10	500	34	0	46	0
	10	500	147	0.06	138	0.06
	10	500	386	0.08	375	0.06
	10	500	76	0.06	82	0.06
	10	500	165	0.06	133	0.00
	10	500	147	0.06	91	0.06
	10	500	117	0.06	116	0.06
	10	500	102	0.00	104	0.00
	10	500	110	0.00	81	0.00
Arithmetic Mean**			138	0.04	125.4	0.03
Moderate Size	30	1800	294	0.12	258	0.08
	30	1800	309	0.09	265	0.14
	30	1800	459	0.14	466	0.22
	30	1800	472	0.17	275	0.08
	30	1800	347	0.06	246	0.06
	30	1800	196	0.06	216	0.06
	30	1800	275	0.12	271	0.06
	30	1800	434	0.12	400	0.12
	30	1800	596	0.08	329	0.12
	30	1800	245	0.06	239	0.08
Arithmetic Mean			362.7	0.10	296.5	0.10
Large-Scale Size	100	30000	737	0.53	743	0.53
	100	30000	658	0.48	710	0.53
	100	30000	808	0.51	846	0.59
	100	30000	746	0.56	841	0.66
	100	30000	713	0.51	780	0.61
	100	30000	770	0.62	802	0.66
	100	30000	691	0.51	729	0.56
	100	30000	661	0.51	680	0.48
	100	30000	681	0.44	684	0.42
	100	30000	845	0.53	856	0.62
Arithmetic Mean			731	0.52	767.1	0.57
Huge-Scale Size	500	500000	3081	63.20	3687	66.64
	500	500000	3107	64.21	3727	68.75
	500	500000	3213	73.09	3663	76.80
	500	500000	3171	64.52	3730	67.39
	500	500000	3084	68.56	3831	68.06
	500	500000	3148	64.85	3691	67.63
	500	500000	3096	67.88	3611	69.58
	500	500000	3122	61.28	3734	64.01
	500	500000	3224	67.17	3829	74.05
	500	500000	3096	66.13	3782	67.45
Arithmetic Mean			3134.2	66.09	3728.5	69.04

"*": the value of computing time is less than 10^{-14} seconds. "**": Since there exists "zero value", we cannot resort to the geometric mean which is used in Sun and Freund. (2004).

convergence of the error ϵ plotted on a log scale. The result is consistent with that in Todd. (2016), that is, the linear convergence takes hold almost from the first iteration.

⟨ **Please Insert Figure 1 Approximately Here** ⟩

Moreover, we would like to know whether the dimension or the number of points influence the efficiency of the two algorithms. We use two types of test samples (i.e., $n = 500, m = 1000$ for the HDSN case and $n = 20, m = 100,000$ for the LDLN case) to test our assumptions. With respect to the HDSN case in figure 5, the ten subgraphs all show that the ACD algorithm outperforms the WA algorithm. However, with respect to the LDLN case in figure 6, the WA algorithm outperforms the ACD algorithm in subgraphs 3, 4, 5, 6, 8 and 10, while in four other subgraphs, the ACD algorithm is better. This comparison shows that the dimension strongly influences the performance of the algorithms, that is, when the dimension of the data set becomes relatively high, the performance of the WA algorithm becomes worse, while the performance of the ACD algorithm becomes better.

⟨ **Please Insert Figure 2 and Figure 3 Approximately Here** ⟩

Moreover, we illustrate the reduction of the objective function under three different iteration types, i.e., "add-" iteration, "plus-" iteration and "minus-" iteration. First, during each "add-" iteration or "plus-" iteration, the reduction of the objective function $h(u)$ is

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta^+(\kappa_+) &= h(u) - h(u^\dagger) \\ &= \ln(2\kappa_+ - n) - \ln(\kappa_+) + \tfrac{(n-\kappa_+)n}{\kappa_+^2},\end{aligned}$$

where $\kappa_+ \geq n$. Second, during each "minus-" iteration step, the reduction of the objective function $h(u)$ is:

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta^-(\kappa_-) &= h(u) - h(u^\dagger) \\ &= \ln \tfrac{\kappa_-}{n} + \tfrac{n}{\kappa_-} - 1\end{aligned}$$

where $0 \leq \kappa_- \leq n$. We illustrate the graph of $\Delta^+(\kappa_+)$ and $\Delta^-(\kappa_-)$ in Figure 4. In Figure 4, the horizontal axis is the value of κ and the vertical axis is the amount of decrement of $h(u)$. We consider three cases of n as $n = 1$, $n = 2$ and $n = 3$, illustrated as blue, green and red lines respectively in Figure 4. The solid line represents the "add-" and "plus-" iteration (namely, the graph of $\Delta^+(\kappa_+)$),

and the dashed line represents the "minus-" iteration (namely, the graph of $\Delta^-(\kappa_-)$). From Figure 4, we can see the following properties:

(1) $\Delta^-(\kappa_-)$ is monotone decreasing with respect to κ_-, while $\Delta^+(\kappa_+)$ is monotone increasing with respect to κ_+.

(2) $\lim_{\kappa_+\to\infty} \Delta^+(\kappa_+) = \ln 2$

(3) When $0 \le \kappa_- \le 0.3n$, $\Delta^-(\kappa_-) > \ln 2$. In other words, when $0 \le \kappa_- \le 0.3n$, $\Delta^-(\kappa_-)$ is always larger than $\Delta^+(\kappa_+)$.

⟨ **Please Insert Figure 4 Approximately Here** ⟩

5. Conclusions

This paper proposed an Adjusted Coordinate Descent Algorithm, which complements the widely used WA algorithm to address the Minimum Volume Enclosing Ellipsoid problem. In particular, the ACD algorithm is more efficient when the dimension of the data set increases. Since the MVEE problem is the basis of many practical problems and applications, such as nonlinear support vector machines and optimal design, the ACD algorithm can be seen as a benefit for solving real-world problems. Specifically, the theoretical contribution of this paper is four-fold:

1. The proposition of a new efficient algorithm: the ACD algorithm. This algorithm inherits the property of globally linear convergence and behaves more efficiently, especially for the high dimensional data sets;

2. The discovery of some new properties of the objective function of the MVEE problem, such as being smooth and strongly convex. We first proved the coordinate smoothness of the objective function and estimated the smoothing parameter with respect to two consecutive points of the ACD algorithm. Next, we used Nesterov's norm to prove that the objective function is m-smooth. Finally, we proved that the objective function is coercive and this fact was applied to obtain the strong convexity of the objective function with respect to its domain.

3. The disclosure of the relationship of the first-order oracle algorithm and the linear optimization oracle algorithm in the MVEE problem. Based on the new properties of the objective function

discovered in this paper, we found a new interpretation of choosing the aim axis of the Frank-Wolfe type algorithm (including the Khachiyan's algorithm and the WA algorithm), that is in terms of the smoothness of the objective function in each coordinate axis. This finding connects the first-order oracle algorithm with the linear optimization oracle algorithm.

4. A rigorous proof of the globally linear convergence of the WA algorithm. Todd found the phenomenon of globally linear convergence of the WA algorithm from a numerical example, and stressed that it would be desirable to prove this phenomenon rigorously. In this paper, the global linear convergence of the WA algorithm is proved as a byproduct of the development of our new algorithm. It is interesting that the proof dose not focus on the WA algorithm, but borrows from the globally linear convergence of the ACD algorithm and the relationships between the ACD algorithm and the WA algorithm.

We also note three directions for future research based on this work. The first point is that although the WA algorithm and the ACD algorithm both inherits the globally linear convergence, the coefficient of the convergence rate may be different. To analyze the linear convergence properties of the two algorithms more precisely is a good question, as it may explain why at the first iteration stage (when the number of the iterations is smaller than 1,000), the WA algorithm outperforms the ACD algorithm, while at the second iteration stage (when the number of the iterations is larger than 1,000), the ACD algorithm has an overwhelming advantage over the WA algorithm. The second point is that we did not take the DRN algorithm into account, since many researchers note that it is not applicable with respect to huge-scale data sets. The reason is that the DRN algorithm resorts to the Hessian of the objective function at each iteration and memory problems arise when the dimension grows. Recently, the Newton-sketch technique was proposed to reduce the dimension of the data sets, which achieved a super-linear convergence rate (see Pilanci and Wainwright. (2015)). Therefore the combination of the DRN algorithm and the Newton-sketch technique is a good point for future research. The final point is that Lu et al. (2016) found the dual problem of the MVEE is 1-smooth relative to $-\sum_{j=1}^{n} \ln x_j$, and presented a new framework to investigate the MVEE problem.

The work of Lu et al. extended the notion of smoothness and strong convexity, which can be applied to many more problems than the classical framework. However, they did not notice the strong convexity of the objective function and therefore failed to obtain the linear convergence rate of their algorithm. In the future we may focus on investigating the relative strong convexity of the objective function to obtain a better convergence result of their primal gradient scheme.

Appendix

PROPOSITION 1. *(1) When $\kappa_+ \geq n > 0$, we have:*

$$\ln(2-\frac{n}{\kappa_+}) - \frac{n(\kappa_+ - n)}{\kappa_+^2} - \frac{(n-\kappa_+)^2}{2\kappa_+^2} \geq 0;$$

(2) When $0 \leq \kappa_- \leq n$, we have:

$$\ln(\frac{\kappa_-}{n}) + \frac{n}{\kappa_-} - 1 - \frac{(n-\kappa_-)^2}{2n\kappa_-} \geq 0;$$

(3) When $\kappa_- \leq n$, and $\frac{\kappa_- - n}{n\kappa_-} < -u_{j-} \leq 0$, we have:

$$nu_{j-} + \ln(1 - u_{j-}\kappa_{j-}) \geq 0$$

Proof of Proposition 1. (1) When $t \geq n$, we have $g_1(t) = \ln(2-\frac{n}{t}) - \frac{n(t-n)}{t^2} - \frac{(n-t)^2}{2t^2}$, and $g_1'(t) = -\frac{n}{t}(\frac{(n-t)^2}{t^2(n-2t)}) \geq 0$. Therefore, $g_1(t)$ is monotone increasing with $t \geq n$. Furthermore, since $g_1(n) = 0$, we have $g_1(t) \geq 0$ when $t \geq n$ and Proposition (1) follows.

(2) When $t \leq n$, we have $g_2(t) = \ln(\frac{t}{n}) + \frac{n}{t} - 1 - \frac{(n-t)^2}{2nt}$ and $g_2'(t) = -\frac{(n-t)^2}{2nt^2} \leq 0$. Therefore, $g_2(t)$ is monotone decreasing with $t \leq n$. Moreover, since $g_2(n) = 0$, thus when $t \leq n$, we have $g_2(t) \geq 0$ and Proposition (2) follows.

(3) When $0 < t < \frac{n-\kappa_-}{n\kappa_-}$ and $\kappa_- < n$, we have $g_3(t) = nt + \ln(1 - t\kappa_-)$ and $g_3'(t) = n - \frac{\kappa_-}{1-\kappa_- t}$. Using $t < \frac{n-\kappa_-}{n\kappa_-}$ we have $g_3'(t) \leq 0$. Therefore, $g_3(t)$ is monotone decreasing with $t > 0$. Moreover, since $g_3(0) = 0$, we have $g_3(t) \geq 0$ when $t > 0$ and Proposition (3) follows. □

Acknowledgments

This paper is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 71601117).

References

Damla Ahipasaoglu S, Sun P, Todd M J (2008) Linear convergence of a modified Frank C Wolfe algorithm for computing minimum-volume enclosing ellipsoids. *OPTIM METHOD SOFTW.* 23(1):5–19.

Ahipasaoglu S D (2009) *Solving Ellipsoidal Inclusion And Optimal Experimental Design Problems: Theory And Algorithms* (Cornell University).

Ahipasaoglu S D (2015) Fast algorithms for the minimum volume estimator. *J GLOBAL OPTIM.* 62(2):351–370.

Atwood C L (1973) Sequences converging to D - optimal designs of experiments. *ANN STATIST.* 342–352.

Bertsekas D P (2015) *Convex optimization algorithms* (Athena Scientific, Belmont, MA).

Boyd S, Vandenberghe L (2004) *Convex Optimization* (Cambridge university press, Cambridge).

John F (2014) *Extremum problems with inequalities as subsidiary conditions* (Springer, Basel).

Joshi S, Boyd S (2009) Sensor selection via convex optimization. *IEEE TRANS SIGNAL PROCESS.* 57(2):451–462.

Khachiyan L G (1996) Rounding of polytopes in the real number model of computation. *MATH OPER RES.* 21(2):307–320.

Kumar P, Yildirim E A (2005) Minimum - volume enclosing ellipsoids and core sets. *J OPTIMIZ THEOR APPL.* 126(1):1–21.

Kumar P, Yildirim E A (2011) A linearly convergent linear - time first - order algorithm for support vector classification with a core set result. *INFORMS J COMPUT.* 23(3):377–391.

Li Y, Wang C, Shene C K (2015) Extracting flow features via supervised streamline segmentation. *COMPUT GRAPH.* 52:79–92.

Lu H, Freund R M, Nesterov Y (2016) *Relatively-Smooth Convex Optimization by First-Order Methods, and Applications* (arXiv:1610.05708).

Nesterov Y, Nemirovskii A (1994) *Interior-point polynomial algorithms in convex programming* (SIAM, Philadelphia).

Nesterov Y (2004) *Introductory Lectures on Convex Optimization: A Basic Course* (Kluwer Academic Publishers, Boston).

Nesterov Y (2011) Efficiency of coordinate descent methods on huge - scale optimization problems. *SIAM J OPTIMIZATION.* 22(2): 341-362.

Nikolov A, Talwar K, Zhang L (2016) The Geometry of Differential Privacy: The Small Database and Approximate Cases. *SIAM J COMPUT.* 45(2):575–616.

Pilanci M, Wainwright M J (2016) *Newton sketch: A linear-time optimization algorithm with linear-quadratic convergence* (arXiv:1505.02250).

Sun P, Freund R M (2004) Computation of minimum - volume covering ellipsoids. *OPER RES.* 52(5):690–706.

Todd M J, Yildirim E A (2007) On Khachiyan's algorithm for the computation of minimum - volume enclosing ellipsoids. *DISCRETE APPL MATH.* 155(13):1731–1744.

Todd M J (2016) *Minimum-volume ellipsoids: Theory and algorithms* (SIAM, Philadelphia).

Vandenberghe L, Boyd S, Wu S P (1998) Determinant maximization with linear matrix inequality constraints. *SIAM J MATRIX ANAL APPLICAT.* 19(2):499–533.

Yildirim E A (2006) On the minimum volume covering ellipsoid of ellipsoids. *SIAM J OPTIMIZATION.* 17(3):621–641.



Figure 1 Efficiency of the WA algorithm and the ACD algorithm on small, moderate, large-scale and huge-scale size samples.



Figure 2 Efficiency of the WA algorithm and the ACD algorithm on HDSN samples.



Figure 3 Efficiency of the WA algorithm and the ACD algorithm on LDLN samples.



Figure 4 Amount of decrement of $h(u)$ of the "add-", "plus-" and "minus-" iteration.